

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 191-202 and 205-216 were pending in the Application. Claims 191 and 205 were amended. Claims 191-202 and 205-216 are now pending in the application.

The amendments of claims 191 and 205 were made to better clarify the present invention. The amendments regarding the existence of “bottom section extensions disposed between the left section and the right section” find support in Figures 23, 21, 20, 20B and 1C, and in the specification on page 28, lines 19-24, and on page 29, lines 1-5. The amendments regarding the restriction that “each one of the front snapping segment and the back snapping segment comprise an inwardly directed bent” find support in Figures 20, 21, 20, 20B and 1F, and in the specification on page 5, lines 25-26, on page 28, lines 26-28, and on page 29, lines 1-5, among other places.

The amendment in the specification on page 1 lines 10-14 of the respective paragraph finds support in the applications referred to. The amendment in the specification on page 50 lines 13-14 of the respective paragraph finds support in Figures 23, 21, 20, 20B and 1C, and in the specification on page 28, lines 19-24, and on page 29, lines 1-5. The amendment in the specification on page 50 lines 19-27 of the respective paragraph finds support in Figures 23, 20, 21, 20, 20B and 1F, and in the specification on page 5, lines 25-26, on page 28, lines 26-28, and on page 29, lines 1-5, among other places.

The amendment of Figures 1C, 1F, 20, 21, 20B, and 23, find support in the Figures themselves, and in the specification on page 28, lines 19-24, on page 29, lines 1-5, and on page 50, lines 5-27.

An information Disclosure Statement is attached.

NEW ARGUMENTS

Regarding Final Rejection of 06/22/2004

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The comments of the Examiner regarding the quotation of 35 USC § 103(a) are acknowledged.

Claims 191, 192, 195-198, 201, 202, 205, 206, 209-212, 215 and 216 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Parkin (U. S. Patent No. 3,426,817).

Applicant respectfully traverses the position of the Office Action. The claims of the present invention, have immense differences when compared to what Parkin (U. S. Patent No. 3,426,817) discloses, not only after the amendment of the claims of the present invention, but even before the amendment. Applicant agrees that if there is no criticality, a shift in the location of parts would be obvious. However, Applicant respectfully submits that there is criticality in this case, because reverse positioning of the parts in the case of Parkin's disclosure would render Parkin's invention barely operable, if operable at all. This would lead a person of ordinary skill in the art away from a shift in the location of parts from where Parkin positions them to where they are positioned according to the instant invention. A person of ordinary skill in the art would tend to avoid such relocation, not only if such relocation would render Parkin's invention barely operable or inoperable, but also the relocation would provide a disadvantage, instead of no effect in operability or of improvement.

Applicant respectfully submits, that even if he accepts, arguendo, the position of the obviousness arguments of the Office Action, there are additional major critical features and elements, which clearly distinguish the present invention from Parkin's disclosure.

First and foremost, the claims of the present invention, even before the amendment, require that the holes in all sections (free-ended top, free-ended lower,

and bottom) are “engageable continuous holes”. The definition of “engageable continuous holes” is given on page 4, lines 23-27 of the specification stating:

“Engageable continuous holes formed on a sheet metal fastener have a helical configuration of the edge of the hole, which helical configuration corresponds to the thread of the screw or bolt to be used in combination with the engageable continuous holes. In some occasions the helical configuration is suitable to fit double threads.”

In contrast, Parkin’ s holes or apertures 9a and 10a have flared lips 11 and 12, which are urged into locking engagement with the adjacent threaded portion of the shank *a* to lock the latter against rotation and thereby secure it in its adjusted position, after manual pressure for alignment of the two apertures has been released (see Figure 4 and column 2, line 56 to column 3, line 8 of Parkin’ s reference).

Thus, Parkin’ s disclosure not only does not obviate the use of exclusively **engageable continuous holes** according to the present invention, but **definitely leads away** from such configuration.

In addition, as claims 191 and 205 have now been amended, require that each one of the front snapping segment 2 and the back snapping segment 4 comprise an **inwardly directed** bent portion 2” and 4”, respectively.

In contrast, Parkin’ s reference discloses a pair of resilient arms 3 and 4 having **outwardly extending** resilient lugs 3a and 4a, and **outwardly projecting** feet 5 and 6 (see Figures 1-3 and column 2, lines 27-32 of Parkin’ s reference).

It should be noted at this point that the Office Action itself equalizes the snapping segments 2 and 4 of the instant invention with the pair of resilient arms 3 and 4 of Parkin’ s reference.

Again, Parkin’ s disclosure not only does not obviate the use of inwardly bent portions originating from the snapping segments according to the present invention, but **definitely leads away** from such configuration.

Further, as claims 191 and 205 have now been amended, require the presence of bottom section extensions 40 disposed between the left side section 18 and the right side section 16, under the front snapping segment 2 and the back snapping segment 4.

In contrast, Parkin' s configuration does not and cannot have such extensions on base 1.

It should be noted at this point that the Office Action itself equalizes the bottom section 14 of the instant invention with the base 1 of Parkin' s reference.

Therefore, Parkin' s disclosure does not obviate by any stretch of imagination the presence of any bottom section extensions from the bottom section.

Therefore, Applicant earnestly believes that independent claims 191 and 205, as well as dependent claims 192, 195-198, 201, 202, 206, 209-212, 215 and 216, which depend directly or indirectly from the respective independent claims 191 and 205, are not obviated under 35 USC § 103(a) over Parkin (U. S. Patent No. 3,426,817), and respectfully requests removal of the rejection.

Claims 193, 194, 199, 200, 207, 208, 213, and 214 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Parkin as above and further in view of Tinnermann (RE 21,769).

Since claims 193, 194, 199, 200, 207, 208, 213, and 214 contain directly or indirectly all limitations of either claim 191 or claim 205, and since Applicant earnestly believes that he has demonstrated the patentability of claims 191 and 295, Applicant also earnestly believes that claims 193, 194, 199, 200, 207, 208, 213, and 214 are also patentable over and in view of the above references, and any further discussion would be moot.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claims 193, 194, 199, 200, 207, 208, 213, and 214.